

Remarks

In the present response, claims 1 – 20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 5-9, 11-13 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,525,932 (Ohnishi) in view of USPN 6,285,833 (Yamane). Claim 14 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane and US 2003/0112325 (Boyden). Claim 15-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of EP 0998144A2 (Bucholz). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of Bucholz. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of Bucholz and Boyden. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane. These rejections are traversed.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art cited must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143. For at least the following reasons, Applicants assert that the rejections do not satisfy these criteria.

The independent claims recite numerous recitations that are not taught or suggested in the art of record. Some examples are provided below.

As one example, claim 1 recites that the camera automatically powers on when ejected from the base portion of a portable computer. The Examiner admits that Ohnishi does not teach this element. Applicants agree with this admission. The Examiner, however, attempts to cure this deficiency with Yamane. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Yamane teaches a camera that uses a single mechanism to control both the pop-up flash and the main power of the camera (see Yamane at col. 3, lines 22-24). A switch located inside the camera actuates upon movement of the pop-up flash. When the switch is activated, the main power of the camera turns on.

In contrast to Yamane, claim 1 recites that the camera automatically powers on “when ejected from the base portion” of the portable computer. The camera in Yamane is not ejected from a base portion of a portable computer. Power to the camera in Yamane is not activated upon ejection of the camera. Instead, power to the camera in Yamane is activated when a pop-up flash on the camera is pushed.

Ohnishi and Yamane do not teach or suggest the claim recitation that a camera automatically powers on when ejected from a base portion of a portable computer. Again, Yamane teaches that the camera powers on when a user pushes a flash pop-up, not when the camera is ejected. There is no motivation or even suggestion to significantly alter Yamane and Ohnishi to teach a camera that automatically powers on when ejected from a portable computer.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane.

Claim 10 recites automatically powering a camera on while ejecting the camera from a computer, and automatically powering the camera off while inserting the camera into the computer. Ohnishi in view of Yamane do not teach or suggest these elements.

As noted above, Yamane teaches powering a camera when a user pushes the flash pop-up. Yamane does not suggest automatically powering a camera on while ejecting the camera from a computer or automatically powering the camera off while inserting the camera into the computer.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 10 and its dependent claims are allowable over Ohnishi in view of Yamane.

Independent claim 15 recites that the camera is electrically coupled to the computer when the camera is mechanically detached from the computer. Figures 8 and 9 in Ohnishi show the camera 420 removed from a portion of the computer 100 but still mechanically connected to a base portion 410 of the computer 100. Ohnishi never discloses or even suggests that the camera remains electrically coupled to the computer while mechanically removed from the computer.

The Examiner argues Ohnishi at column 17, lines 30-34. This section of Ohnishi teaches that the camera is mechanically connected to the computer through a shaft 430. While connected to the shaft and computer, the camera can capture images. Nowhere

does Ohnishi teach or even suggest that the camera is electrically coupled to the computer while being mechanically removed from the computer. Again, Ohnishi teaches that the camera captures images while still mechanically connected to the computer.

For at least these reasons, independent claim 15 and its dependent claims are allowable over Ohnishi in view of Bucholz.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529